

Serial No.: 10/531,115

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional claim fee is required for this Amendment as the number of independent claims has not changed, and the total number of claims is less than originally filed.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview, to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Substitute Specification

Applicant has amended the paragraph at page 9 to include the reference element 3.5 added to FIG. 2B. No new matter has been added to the Substitute Specification by this Amendment.

Serial No.: 10/531,115

Amendment to the Drawings

Applicant has added the element reference numbers 3.5, 9.11, and 9.12 to FIGS. 2B and 3A-B, respectively. No new matter has been added to the drawings by this Amendment.

Amendment to the Claims

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include reworded limitations from Claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled in view of amended Claim 1, and Claim 3 is amended to depend on Claim 1. Claims 13 and 14 have been canceled as redundant in view of amended Claim 1 and Claims 3 and 4.

Applicant has amended Claims 3 and 4 to recite “roller units” as discussed on page 9 of the Specification.

Applicant has deleted a portion of Claims 5 and 14 in response to the Office Action’s objections.

Applicant has amended Claims 8 and 17 to provide antecedent bases for claim limitations.

No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Election/Restriction

Applicant maintains the traversal of the restriction requirement. Claim 1 now includes limitations of Claim 2, which, as discussed below, provides a “unifying novel inventive concept” that is not “well known” in the prior art. The restriction requirement is improper for being made while relying on identified prior art references. Making restriction requirements based upon prior art rejection results in the problem of the requirement being moot when the prior art rejections are overcome, as is the case here. The withdrawn dependent claims should be rejoined.

Objections to the Specification

The objection to the Specification is not understood, as the Substitute Specification includes the headers discussed on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant believes this objection is a mistake.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to for including the reference numbers 9.11 and 9.12. Applicant believes the objection is meant to be that the drawings do not include these reference numbers, as they are mentioned in the specification but not

Serial No.: 10/531,115

shown in the drawings. Applicant has added these reference numbers to FIGS. 3A and 3B.

The drawings have further been objected to for not showing features of Claims 2, 3, and 5. The features of Claim 2 have been clarified through amended Claim 1, and these features are shown in FIGS. 3A and 3B. The features of amended Claim 3 are shown in amended FIG. 2B. The features objected to in Claim 5 have been removed from Claim 5.

Claim Objections

Claims 4 and 8 have been amended in response to the objections thereto. Applicant believes the above Amendment renders these objections moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, for the reasons set forth at pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action.

The limitations of Claim 2 have been clarified in amended Claim 1. The limitations of amended Claim 1 find support in the Substitute Specification at page 7, last paragraph through page 8, second full paragraph. Regarding the angle compensation element, the Examiner is directed to element 9.4 in FIGS. 3A and 3B.

Serial No.: 10/531,115

Applicant believes that the above Amendment and comments overcome the rejection of Claims 2-11. The undersigned attorney requests a call if further clarification is deemed necessary.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Füsser, U.S. Patent 4,442,694, is respectfully traversed.

The Füsser Patent does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended Claim 1. The Füsser Patent does not teach Applicant's lateral compensation element including an intermediate piece that forms a ball socket on one side for receiving a ball shaped angle compensation element and on an opposing side either forming a second ball socket or seated on a laterally movable bearing. In the Füsser Patent a **flat** end of the lower ball cup 125 is **fixedly** (it doesn't move side-to-side) connected within the piston 112. The lower ball cup 125 neither has a second socket nor is seated on a laterally moving bearing, as are recited in Applicant's claimed invention.

Serial No.: 10/531,115

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103


The rejection of Claims 3-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Füsser, U.S. Patent 4,442,694, in view of JP 62267100, is respectfully traversed. Claims 3-11 depend from amended Claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Applicant intends to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicant has not addressed or resolved in this response, the undersigned attorney again requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicant sincerely believes that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully requests early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Regis. No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road, Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403